



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,356	02/17/2004	Luis F. Barron	DP-310740	9940

7590 02/24/2005

JIMMY L. FUNKE
DELPHI TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
Legal Staff, Mail Code: 480-410-202
P.O. Box 5052
Troy, MI 48007-5052

EXAMINER

DEVORE, PETER T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3751

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/780,356	Applicant(s) BARRON ET AL. <i>OW</i>	
	Examiner Peter T deVore	Art Unit 3751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6-14, 16-24 and 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5, 15 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 10, 16-18, 20, 21, and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sugiura.

The Sugiura reference discloses a valve (see Figure 5) comprising a housing with a valve seat (on portion 80), seat blocking means/ball 85, actuation means/rod (pin 53 and shaft 50) with a stepped portion (portion of rod opposite ball contacting end), energization means/coil 44, a ball retainer rib (on portion 81), a supply port 84, an exhaust port 82, and a control port 83, and which rod further interacts with the ball as claimed (see col. 4, lines 63-65).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-8, 11, 13, 14, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiura.

Regarding claims 1, 6-8, 11, and 22, the Sugiura reference discloses a valve as discussed supra, but remains silent as to the distance between the rod and the ball when de-energized. However, it would have been obvious to employ such a distance of between 0.1 and 0.8 mm, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. In re Aller, 105 USPQ 2336.

Regarding claims 3, 4, 13, 14, and 24, the Sugiura reference discloses a valve as discussed supra, but remains silent as to the material the ball, pin, and shaft are made from. However, it would have been obvious to make the pin from a harder ferromagnetic material and the shaft from a softer non-ferromagnetic material, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In Re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

Claims 2, 12, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiura in view of Wisniewski or Inden.

The Sugiura reference discloses a valve as discussed supra, but does not disclose that the valve seat and winding bay are integral. However, the Wisniewski and Inden reference disclose similar valves wherein the valve seat and winding bay are integral for simpler construction of the valve. It would have been obvious to modify the

Art Unit: 3751

Sugiura valve such that the valve seat and winding bay are integral in view of Wisniewski or Inden for simpler construction of the valve.

Claims 9, 19, and 29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugiura in view of Hayakawa.

The Sugiura reference discloses a valve as discussed supra, but remains silent as to the environment in which it operates. However, The Hayakawa teaches that such valves are useful in vehicle fluid systems because they are effective in controlling ABS systems (see col. 1, lines 8-11). It would have been obvious to use the Sugiura valve in a vehicle fluid system in view of Kayakawa because such valve is effective in controlling an ABS system.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 15, and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter T deVore whose telephone number is (571) 272-4884. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Justine Yu can be reached on (571) 272-4835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pd JV

Patricia Silva